NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.

RPTS SHIPLE

HIF041170

INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVES ON THE

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2016

House of Representatives,

Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing,

and Trade,

Committee on Energy and Commerce,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael Burgess [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Burgess, Lance, Blackburn, Harper, Guthrie, Olson, Pompeo, Kinzinger, Bilirakis, Brooks, Schakowsky, Clarke, Kennedy, Welch, and Pallone (ex officio).

Staff present: Rebecca Card, Assistant Press Secretary;

James Decker, Policy Coordinator, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Graham Dufault, Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Melissa Froelich, Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Paul Nagle, Chief Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Olivia Trusty, Professional Staff, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Dylan Vorbach, Legislative Clerk, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Michelle Ash, Minority Chief Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Christine Brennan, Minority Press Secretary; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Lisa Goldman, Minority Counsel, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority Deputy Staff Director and Chief Health Advisor; Caroline Paris-Behr, Minority Policy Analyst; Diana Rudd, Minority Legal Fellow; and Andrea Sowall, Minority Staff Member.

Mr. Burgess. The Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade will now come to order. The chair will recognize himself for an opening statement.

I want to welcome everyone to the committee this morning. This morning we do continue our oversight of the Consumer Product Safety Commission and its mission to protect consumers against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products. It is a very timely hearing, as we prepare to enter into our budget season.

This subcommittee held a hearing earlier this Congress with four of the commissioners present about the status of the agency agenda. Really two key issues emerged that warrant further attention. First, the need for collaboration between the Commission and industry to achieve voluntary safety standards for regulated products. Secondly, there were concerns about the Commission's over-extended rulemaking docket. There were concerns about mission creep and there were concerns about repeated requests for unprecedented user fee authority without the requisite justification. And I did stress at the time and will stress again today that when your mission is safety and your resources are scarce, it is critical that you prioritize your activities where you have clear authority and where you can protect the most people.

I hope we will hear about progress today, particularly on the recreational off-road vehicle front. I hope that we will hear about a commission that wants to use technology to help innovation, rather than impede it. We have done a whole set of hearings on technology disrupting industry. At some point, we need to look at how technology can disrupt Washington and make it work, make Washington work better to encourage innovations and to encourage job creation.

The innovation driven by the private sector cannot be replicated in the confines of the government. This is recognized by the preference for voluntary safety standards and the Commission's authorizing statute, the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act, and even in the Office of Management of the Budget. Their recent circular A-119, where they coordinate and clear things through the Office of Management of the Budget that is currently in the process of being updated.

The American National Standards Institute, the Underwriters
Laboratory are widely known and respected institutions that have
worked with industry within and outside the Commission's
jurisdiction to help develop voluntary consensus standards.
These standards are technical in nature and are generally set to
achieve, as their name implies, performance goals, as opposed to
the government mandating product construction.

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

Turning to the Commission's rulemaking docket and request for unprecedented user fee authority, I am interested in hearing from our witnesses today about how these outstanding issues impact a company's ability to plan for the future and a company's ability to innovate. For example, since our last hearing, there has been no change in the status of some of the most controversial processes in rulemaking. This includes a rulemaking that is still pending to upend the incredibly successful voluntary recall program. import surveillance rulemaking, commonly known as the 1110 Rule has now been turned into a pilot program with eight participating The pilot's implementation guide was implemented companies. just a few weeks ago to reflect the first feedback received from the Customs and Border Protection Support Network Working Group. The Commission has renewed their request for unprecedented user fee authority which, besides the constitutional question at hand, is premature, given the early stages of the pilot project.

I am interested to hear from the panelists what outstanding issues remain with the pilot's development and what benchmarks we should be looking for when the Commission reports on the pilot's progress.

Finally, it is incumbent upon this subcommittee to find out whether there has been any progress on reducing third party testing burdens for small businesses in the United States. This

is a bipartisan concern and has been addressed multiple times by Congress since 2011. It is frustrating to be sitting here today years later without this issue being resolved.

I think we all share the goal of preventing tragic and unfortunate injuries from consumer products. I certainly look forward to hearing from our witnesses about the status and tenor of their working relationship with the Commission and how these relationships can be leveraged to achieve the common safety goal. Industry certainly must do its part.

And now I would like to recognize the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms. Schakowsky from Illinois, 5 minutes for an opening statement, please.

Ms. Schakowsky. I thank the chairman -- we have got some feedback here -- for holding today's hearing on the Consumer Product Safety Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to highlight the successes of the Commission and to learn where even more progress can be made.

This hearing is to focus specifically on industry perspectives. And while it is important to hear from business under the CPSC oversight, I believe the focus should always be on the Commission's impact in protecting consumers from harmful products and that is what I plan to spend my time on today.

This subcommittee played a major role in the enactment of

the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act, which was signed into law by President Bush in 2008. It was the product of broad bipartisan negotiation and it passed the House by a vote of 407 to nothing. The legislation gave CPSC additional authority and resources so it could become the consumer watchdog that Americans deserve. It included a provision requiring mandatory standards and testing for infant and toddler products, such as cribs and highchairs, as well as a requirement for postage paid recall registration cards to be attached to products so that customers can be quickly notified if the products are dangerous and I was proud to author both of those improvements.

The CPSIA also included mandatory toy safety standards, including banning lead and dangerous phthalates in toys which are preventing injuries and saving lives.

The Commission has taken its enhanced authority and support to improve consumer product safety from cribs to toys, to cleaning products and I look forward to hearing from our witnesses about those successes and others.

I also look forward to hearing from our witnesses their ideas for how to improve consumer outreach. In the context of auto safety, we have discussed ways to improve notice to consumers of recalls and how to increase consumer responsiveness to recalls. That same concept is just as important in this context, where

notice to consumers and consumer response is actually much lower but where failure to act can have a similar deadly consequence.

I will say that I am disappointed that today's hearing does not include a member panel on bills related to CPSC oversight and regulation of guns, which no less than four members have asked for. With an ever worsening gun crisis in this country and a legitimate debate about whether CPSC should have the authority to protect consumers in this area, it seems obvious that we should be exploring these legislative proposals. Unfortunately, requests to testify from Representatives Engle, Honda, Robin Kelly, and Maloney were denied by the majority.

Again, I look forward to hearing from our witnesses about the progress we have seen at the Consumer Product Safety Commission and where the Commission should go from here.

Let me just say with a couple minutes, before I was elected to office, I identified myself as a consumer advocate. And I am sure many of you enjoy or appreciate being able to see dates on food. And in 1970, when I was a very young housewife, we got together, five of us, six of us, I was the sixth, and modestly called ourselves National Consumers United, all six of us. And we went to work cracking the codes that were on every product. You could not tell how old the food was. It was kind of a raucous campaign with lawyers involved from the retailers, et cetera.

And finally, we did win this because it has so much favor among consumers but it also really helped the retailers with their inventory control. Because seeing everybody being able to see the dates, there were no laws passed, but the whole idea mushroomed, snowballed, and now people really rely on those dates.

So, I guess my point is this, that we can find ways where consumers and the industry, our interest coincide and we make life better for everyone. That incident as a very young housewife really changed my life, as someone who could get something done. And it has been my mission ever since that we find ways that we can make the marketplace more fair for consumers.

And I yield back.

Mr. Burgess. The gentlelady yields back. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Tennessee for 5 minutes for an opening statement, please.

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to welcome those of you who are on the panel today. Please know we have a Medicaid hearing going on down on the first floor. So, we are going to be back and forth a little bit today in sharing our time.

The chairman mentioned some of the problems with the 1110 import system and we are going to want to come back to you on that

issue with some questions. Third party testing burdens, there are some issues that remain with this program.

I really would like to just go a little bit to the point. We feel as if we have given you a mandate to reduce these regulatory burdens and testing burdens and to look at the marketplace as a whole and to say how do we achieve our goals with product safety, consumer safety, and how do we do this in an effective and efficient manner, that is going to be fair to the taxpayer. And we are going to look at you, come to you with some questions about how you are relieving that regulatory burden and what you see as being some best steps, next steps as we try to reduce that.

With that Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield back my time but say we do want to approach a couple of these specific issues with specific answers. Thank you.

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentlelady. The gentlelady yields back.

The chair recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, 5 minutes for an opening statement, please.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to start by noting that we received letters from Representative Engle, a member of the full committee, Mr. Honda, Mr. Maloney, and Ms. Kelly requesting a member panel at this

hearing. And each of these members has introduced legislation that would amend the jurisdiction of the Consumer Product Safety Commission over guns and toy guns. And I think the issues raised by these members certainly is worthy of discussion and I am disappointed that the request was denied by the chairman and by the majority.

While the topic of today's hearing was listed as industry perspectives on the CPSC, I am encouraged that the perspective of consumer advocates was added and I look forward to that testimony.

In 2008, Congress passed the Consumer Product Safety
Improvement Act, CPSIA, and in follow-up legislation 2011 made
major improvements to CPSC's operations and to the safety of
consumer products. One of the most successful sections of the
CPSIA was the Danny Keysar Child Product Safety Notification Act,
which was authored by our ranking member Schakowsky. And this
portion of the law requires the Commission to develop mandatory
safety standards for durable infant or toddler products, such as
infant walkers, highchairs and cribs. Final safety standards for
14 products have been promulgated and proposed safety standards
for six more products have been issued.

And that is great progress but there is still more to do.

As the Commission moves beyond implementation of the CPSIA, the

Commission need an agile system to deal with emerging hazards. Recently, we have heard numerous reports of hoverboards catching fire or exploding, not to mention all those videos of riders falling off of their hoverboards.

There is the ongoing issue of artificial turf fields. For over a year, I have been calling on the CPSC and others to conduct a comprehensive review of these fields and questioning the safety of crumb rubber used on artificial playing turf and playgrounds across the country. That crumb rubber is made from recycled tires that often contain cancer-causing chemicals. It is clear that we need more information about the safety of crumb rubber. But in the meantime, kids play on it every day and so we need to begin this review immediately.

Although the CPSC Commissioners are not hear today, I look forward to hearing from our witnesses about how the CPSC can work with industry and consumer safety advocates on these types of emerging hazards. I want to know how the Commission can best address foreseeable risk and be better prepared when unexpected problems occur.

We should strive for proactive safety instead of just waiting to react after injuries or deaths occur. We should continue to encourage new and innovative products but they must be safe for consumers.

And the CPSC plays a vital role in protecting lives of all Americans. It is a small agency with a big mission but we must ensure that the CPSC has the support from Congress and the resources it needs to fulfill its mission.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back. The chair thanks the gentleman.

The chair would note, and I think the members of the subcommittee would agree with me, that we offer our condolences to you and your family on the recent loss of your father.

Certainly, our thoughts are with you, Frank.

That concludes our opening statements.

We want to thank all of our witnesses for being here today and for taking the time to testify before the subcommittee.

Today's witnesses will have the opportunity to give opening statements, followed by questions from us. Our panel for today's hearing will include Mr. Erik Pritchard, the Executive Vice President and General Counsel for the Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association; Mr. Jonathan Gold, the Vice President for Supply Chain and Customs Policy at the National Retail Federation; Ms. Rachel Weintraub, the Legislative Director and General Counsel for the Consumer Federation of America; and Mr. Mark Fellin, Director of Regulatory and Legislative Affairs at the

Juvenile Products Manufacturing Association.

JUVENILE PRODUCTS MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

We sincerely appreciate all of you being here today. We thank you for the privilege of your time. We will begin the panel with Mr. Pritchard and you are recognized for 5 minutes for an opening statement, please.

STATEMENTS OF ERIK PRITCHARD, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL, RECREATIONAL OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ASSOCIATION; JONATHAN GOLD, VICE PRESIDENT, SUPPLY CHAIN AND CUSTOMS POLICY AT THE NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION; RACHEL WEINTRAUB, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR AND GENERAL COUNSEL, CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA; AND MARK FELLIN, DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,

STATEMENT OF ERIK PRITCHARD

Mr. Pritchard. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, ranking member, and members of the committee. My name is Erik Pritchard.

The green light is on. Is that better? Okay, I will start over.

Good morning. Mr. Chairman, ranking member, members of the committee, my name is Erik Pritchard. I am the Executive Vice President and General Counsel of the Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association, commonly known as ROHVA. ROHVA is a not-for-profit trade association sponsored by Arctic Cat, BRP,

Honda, John Deere, Kawasaki, Polaris, Textron, and Yamaha.

2.78

ROHVA was formed to promote the safe and responsible use of recreational off-highway vehicles, commonly referred to as ROVs or side-by-sides, I like ROV, manufactured and distributed in North America. ROVs are used by families, emergency personnel, and the U.S. military in a variety of environments ranging from mud to sand, to forest to trials. This is a vibrant high-growth industry and a bright spot in the U.S. manufacturing economy.

I last appeared before this subcommittee on May 19, 2015. Then, as now, the topic was the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC, which is the principle federal regulator of the ROV industry. But much has changed over the last 8 months since that hearing.

By way of background, ROHVA is accredited by the American National Standards Institute, ANSI, to develop voluntary standards for the equipment configuration and performance requirements of ROVs. Voluntary does not mean opt-in or opt-out. Voluntary standards become the benchmark against which product design and performance is judged. Really, voluntary means industry and other stakeholders, including the CPSC and consumers, voluntarily develop product standards pursuant to ANSI standards development procedures.

I am pleased to report that the ROV industry and the CPSC,

as well as other stakeholders have worked together to develop an updated voluntary standard for ROVs, effectively mooting the CPSC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for ROVs. In this regard, CPSC staff's December 1, 2015 to ROHVA reads, "CPSC staff supports the proposed changes to the voluntary standard and believes the aggregate effect of improved vehicle stability, handling, and occupant protection will reduce injuries and deaths associated with ROV rollovers."

As a result of this support, we expect that once the updated voluntary standard is published, likely in a few months, CPSC staff will recommend that the Commission terminate the rulemaking. This positive outcome resulted from the joint efforts of industry and CPSC staff, and through Congress' leadership, including, in particular, the efforts of this subcommittee.

Without belaboring the history, industry discussions with the CPSC had some positive momentum back in September and October of 2014, when representatives of ROHVA and each member company traveled to Rockville and Bethesda, Maryland to explain how close the parties were and that any differences could be overcome through further discussion.

Unfortunately, that momentum stalled on October 29, 2014, when the Commission voted three to two to issue its Notice of

Proposed Rulemaking for ROVs. Nevertheless, the industry and CPSC resumed their discussions with meetings in March, May, July, and October 2015, culminating with ROHVA circulating the updated draft voluntary standard a few months ago.

The leadership and efforts of the U.S. Congress were instrumental in helping industry and the CPSC achieve this positive result. Senators and representatives from both parties repeatedly the CPSC to engage in the voluntary standards process, rather than pursue rulemaking. This subcommittee went further and elicited testimony from various stakeholders, including from CPSC Commissioners and the industry, regarding the ROV In-Depth Examination Act, the RIDE Act, which would require an independent examination of CPSC's proposals in supporting data by the National Academy of Sciences, among others.

Due to the successful agency-industry collaboration on the updated voluntary standard, however, it now appears that that review required by the RIDE Act will not be necessary. This process was costly and time-consuming for both CPSC and the industry and we appreciate the CPSC staff's diligence in working through the issues with us.

It is indisputable that the U.S. Congress has other important and complex business and yet, Congress and this subcommittee took the time to provide the necessary oversight essential to a

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

properly functioning regulatory system. That is no small thing.

On behalf of the ROV industry, thank you for your dedication to helping resolve this important matter.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pritchard follows:]

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentleman. The gentleman yields back.

352

353

354

Mr. Gold, 5 minutes for an opening statement, please.

STATEMENT OF JONATHAN GOLD

Mr. Gold. Good morning Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Schakowsky, and distinguished members of the subcommittee.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning and provide NRF's views on the activities and developments at the CPSC. I would like to ask that my full statement be included in the record.

NRF is the world's largest retail trade association, representing all segments of the retail industry. We have a proud history of engaging with the CPSC, especially since the enactment of the CPSIA. While we have had some issues with its implementation and interpretation, we have always sought to positively interact with the CPSC with the viewpoint and objective of ensuring that products our members sell are safe for American families.

NRF's members have no interest in selling unsafe or violative products. A vibrant and well-resourced CPSC and a marketplace free of unsafe products is aligned with the interest and desires of retailers and the safety well-being of their consumers.

NRF has, for several years, strongly encouraged the CPSC to create a permanent trade advisory group similar to the Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the COAC, which routinely advises the CBP on the many complex issues related to both imports and exports of goods.

The CPSC did facilitate the formation of a product safety and working group under the COAC to advise on the proposed product safety certificate e-filing mandate, the Section 1110 Rule. We appreciate Chairman Kaye helping to facilitate this working group, which has led to the creation of the current e-Filing Alpha Pilot. Again, having an official advisory committee in place to tackle these and other complex supply chain-related issues will help the CPSC in the future.

Now, the Section 1110 Rule did contain many troubling provisions in addition to the sweeping new mandate, including possibly changing who is required to issue the CPSC certificate and expansion of the data required on the certificates. We hope the pilot will address some of these issues and concerns that we have moving forward.

NRF members are also concerned with two of the proposed regulations that may have little benefit to consumer safety but enormous burdens on the regulated industry. These include the proposed Voluntary Recall Rule and the so-called 6(b) Rule. NRF strongly questions these proposals' necessity, let alone the enhancement of product safety. We have placed new mandates and burdens on companies that voluntarily report information to and that offer to voluntarily recall products in conjunction with the CPSC.

Chairman Kaye has publicly stated that these two proposed rules are not his priorities. We would then urge the Commission to fully withdraw these proposals and initiate formal stakeholder discussions about how such rules can be best served and benefit consumers.

Another related proposal before the Congress is a renewed request by the agency for authority to impose user fees for the agency's Risk Assessment Methodology to screen imports for possible product safety violations and risk. While we strongly support risk-based targeting, we have many questions about how such user fee will be developed, collected, and used.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that programs such as the Retail Reporting Program could continue to provide valuable information to the agency. The program is in limbo right now, as the agency continues to conduct an internal review. We believe a robust retail reporting program will provide benefits to the CPSC, program participants, and most importantly consumers, by alerting the agency to product safety issues at the very earliest stage possible.

As the CPSC moves forward towards regulating in the enormously complex and fast-changing global supply chain, we strongly believe that the agency needs to further collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure that regulations not only meet their

stated goal, but do so in a way that does not overly burden the industry. Regulations must not only work, but they must be implemented in a seamless manner.

I will note that there does appear to be a new spirit of bipartisanship among the commissioners. Chairman Kaye, all of the commissioners and senior staff seem to be more willing to listen to the views, the concerns of agency stakeholders. These are very welcome trends and ones which we again hope will materialize into more permanent efforts to engage the public and those most impacted by the Commission.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly raise an issue of concern for retailers; that is, the real and growing trend of the CPSC to look primarily to retailers for recalls and other corrective and punitive actions, rather than other participants in the supply chain that might be better positioned to both identify and respond to product safety issues. Traditionally, the CPSC has looked primarily to product manufacturers to identify and report product safety issues as well as undertake product safety recalls. This makes sense, since the product manufacturers are typically in the best position to identify, understand, and respond to product design, manufacturing, or other problems that may lead to a consumer hazard. That presumptions seems to have been reversed and more and more recalls

are being sought first and, in many cases, solely of retailers.

Mr. Chairman, years of adjustment immediately following enactment of the CPSIA were difficult and, at times, even chaotic. Things seem to have regularized and NRF and its members recognize and appreciate the recent efforts of this Commission and the dedicated CPSC staff to try to bring additional clarity and stakeholder to the agency's still-changing policies and practices, though much more remains to be done on this front.

The traditional agency model of everything invented here no longer works in a real-time world of global supply chain dynamics. We are dedicated to continue positive engagement with the agency and its leaders to ensure that the safety of American families continues to be our mutual and primary objective.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify and I look forward to questions. [The prepared statement of Mr. Gold follows:]

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentleman. The

chair now recognizes Ms. Weintraub, 5 minutes for your opening

statement, please.

STATEMENT OF RACHEL WEINTRAUB

Ms. Weintraub. Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member
Schakowsky, Ranking Member Pallone, and members of the
subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to provide testimony
on CFA's perspectives on the CPSC.

I am Rachel Weintraub, Legislative Director and General Counsel with CFA. CFA is a non-profit association of approximately 280 pro-consumer groups that was founded in 1968 to advance the consumer interest through advocacy, research and education.

The CPSC has been working hard to protect consumers from product hazards. The CPSC has been communicating with businesses about CPSC rules in an unprecedented way, including the recent release of a regulatory robot, which will help businesses determine which product safety rules apply to their products in real time. The Small Business Ombudsman has been speaking to business stakeholder business groups, has provided direct guidance to thousands of callers and has revamped its website to provide clear information.

The implementation of the CPSIA has been a high priority and should continue to be so for the CPSC. The CPSC has promulgated more rules than it ever has in its history and has done so in a relatively short period. The rule are substantively strong and

have had an important and positive impact on consumers. Because of the rules promulgated by the CPSC, over a dozen infant durable products, including cribs, infant walkers, play yards, and strollers must now meet new robust standards. For all of these products, third party testing and certification requirements are required. This work must continue.

Another high priority for the CPSC is the consumer incident database, saferproducts.gov, required by CPSIA. Some 27,273 reports have been posted to the site and the database is an important and useful tool for consumers, researchers, doctors, coroners, and the CPSC. We urge the CPSC and Congress to use this resource to protect consumers.

We urge the CPSC to prioritize these emerging and longstanding issues that they are already working to address. For example, the CPSC is actively investigating at least 48 hoverboard fires in 19 states. The CPSC sent out two statements on hoverboards warning consumers of potential risks, announcing investigations into the incidents and providing consumer recommendations. The CPSC announcements have been relied upon by many entities who have sought to protect consumers. Unfortunately, we know that these products remain in consumers' homes, potentially posing risks.

Potential safety concerns have been raised about crumb

rubber from tire scraps that are used in playground surfacing and synthetic field surfacing. Health risks posed by these materials could include lead exposure and cancer risks.

In 2008, CPSC issued a statement indicating that artificial turf made from crumb rubber was okay to install and okay to play on. But CPSC has since distanced itself from that release, causing consumer uncertainty and concern.

CPSC is providing technical assistance to California's review of crumb rubber and is working with other agencies with jurisdictions over this product. CPSC needs an increase in their budget appropriation to ensure that these and other emerging safety issues can be effectively addressed.

I now wish to discuss a few long-standing hazards that are priorities for the Consumer Federation and should also be for CPSC and Congress.

Window coverings. Due to the documented and persistent hazards that cords on window coverings pose to children, in May of 2013, CFA and others filed a petition requesting that the CPSC promulgate a mandatory standard to make operating cords for window coverings inaccessible. At least 11 children die each year, despite six industry attempts at developing adequate voluntary standards. Deaths and injuries can be eliminated by designs that already exist and are available on the market.

Flame retardants in consumer products. These can be found in numerous types of consumer products that have been associated with serious health problems. These chemicals migrate out from the household products into air and dust. Children are especially at risk.

The CPSC is considering a petition filed by CFA and others to adopt mandatory standards to protect consumers from health hazards posed by the use of non-polymeric, additive form, organohalogen flame retardants in children's products, furniture, mattresses, and the casings surrounding electronics.

Recreational off-highway vehicles pose hazards to consumers and the CPSC indicates there were 335 deaths and 506 injuries related to ROVs from January 2013 to April 2013. ATVs injured at least 93,700 people in 2014 and killed an estimated 638 people as well. More work needs to be done on these issues.

Recall effectiveness. The vast majority of consumers who own a product never find out that the product they own has been recalled. Much more needs to be done.

I thank you for your consideration.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Weintraub follows:]

558 | ********* INSERT 3*******

559 Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentlelady. The
560 chair recognizes Mr. Fellin, 5 minutes to summarize your opening
561 statement, please.

STATEMENT OF MARK FELLIN

Mr. Fellin. Thank you, Chairman Burgess and Ranking Member Schakowsky for the opportunity to provide testimony to this committee.

JPMA is a is a national not-for-profit trade association representing 95 percent of the prenatal industry, including the producers, importers, and distributors of a broad range of child care articles that provide protection to infants and assistance to their care givers. Innovating, manufacturing, and providing safe products is a priority for JPMA members.

As a new father to my 5-week-old son, Tucker, I personally understand the importance of ensuring that our children are safe in all environments and that parents and caregivers are educated about the importance of using juvenile products safely.

My testimony today will focus on three areas. First, JPMA's relationship with the CPSC as it relates to Section 104 of the CPSIA. Second, the CPSC staff involvement throughout the ASTM process and, third, industry concerns that the integrity of the ASTM Standard setting process be maintained as it relates to Section 104 rules.

JPMA has been instrumental in the development of many key standards that have advanced public safety. For example, ASTM Subcommittee F15.18 on cribs, toddler beds, and changing tables

received former Chairman Inez Tenenbaum's inaugural Chairman's Circle of Commendation Award for its work as crucial to the development of CPSC's new mandatory crib standards, the strongest in the world.

JPMA and CPSC staff have worked collaboratively throughout the ASTM process. Relying on each other's expertise, we have been able to enhance safety through the ASTM consensus process by facilitating the creation of effective standards based upon hazard data. Like any relationship, it is not always without complications. Let me be very clear. Our industry appreciates uniform national safety regulations. The ASTM process is the backbone of many advances in product safety. However, this process is based upon consensus agreement only after consideration of data and sound hazard analysis.

Over the years, our members have taken CPSC input into account when developing and revising the ASTM Juvenile Product Standards. We believe in the collaborative nature of the process. However, for its part, CPSC staff must better understand and appreciate the realities of implementing standards for the design and production of actual products.

As this committee knows, the CPSC is a data-driven agency.

ASTM participants often rely on CPSC staff to provide summaries

of verified incident data and engineering analysis.

Historically, such data has been provided in accordance with CPSA Section 6 requirements. Unfortunately, most recently, such data has not been shared as required for effective standard setting. We urge the CPSC to provide such data, as available, and believe that the process works best when there is a two-way street.

We agree with the CPSC's recent recognition and strategic plan to address such shortfalls and applaud its desire to improve its data systems and increase databased decisionmaking.

Additionally, our members have significant concerns about the manner in which warnings are currently being discussed through the ASTM process. We remain committed to safety and advancing the standards but believe that arbitrarily changing language and/or format in the NPR, after it has been discussed and balloted on multiple occasions within the ASTM process, does not allow for the best standard to be incorporated as the final rule.

Additionally, staff action has created the perception amongst many participants at ASTM that the CPSC will ultimately change the standard during mandatory rulemaking, regardless of consensus at ASTM.

At the end of last year, participants of ASTM shared in a letter to the chairman this sentiment and urges CPSC to delay implementation of any juvenile product rulemaking specific to product, package, and instruction warning, until a

consensus-based approach could be reached. That letter has been submitted for the record for your review.

JPMA believes strongly in the importance of effective recall, combined with government cooperation. The CPSC's award-winning voluntary recalls program has saved manufacturers countless hours of negotiations and ensured that recalled products are voluntarily and quickly removed from traditional and virtual store shelves. The proposed changes to the voluntary recalls rule are unnecessary and problematic. Congress has had, on multiple occasions, the opportunity to make changes to the 6(b) process but has not. We believe that the confidentiality safeguards available under CPSA Section 6(b) are vital in maintaining a process that has been in place and working for decades.

While we do not agree with the Commission's decision to keep these projects in the operating plan, we do appreciate the chairman's public commitments that neither of these will be heard for decisional vote.

The CPSC and JPMA share the same goal, to advance safety. We commend the chairman for his willingness to work with industry on issues, such as the electronic filling of certificates at import. We are also encouraged with recent studies commissioned by the CPSC to look for ways to reduce the burdens posed by

excessive third party testing requirements and hope that these efforts will finally result in meaningful relief to all companies, specifically small ones.

The CPSC leadership and staff continue to state that there is an open door policy at the agency for all stakeholders. It is paramount that this policy be maintained and respected.

We look forward to our continuing engagement with the committee and the CPSC and the ability to walk through an open door.

Thank you Chairman Burgess and members of the committee for calling this hearing and inviting JPMA to testify. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fellin follows:]

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentleman. The chair thanks all of our witnesses today. I certainly thank you for spending your time with us this morning.

We will move now into the questions portion of the hearing.

I will recognize myself for 5 minutes for questions first.

And Mr. Fellin, congratulations on the birth of your 5-week-old.

Mr. Fellin. Thank you.

Mr. Burgess. You look awfully well-rested for someone with a 5-week-old at home.

Mr. Fellin. I have a very supportive wife.

Mr. Burgess. There you go.

Well, your members are pretty heavily engaged in voluntary standards in a unique manner. Can you give us a sense of the overall relationship between your industry and the Commission? Where is the collaboration particularly strong and where are there points of tension?

Mr. Fellin. Overall, the relationship between our agency and the CPSC in the ASTM process is extremely strong. We have had multiple occasions where CPSC has referenced the final ASTM rule without changes. So, for the most part, it is a good and positive dialogue.

Where there is concern right now amongst industry and our

relationship are really when it comes down to warning labels and the way that discussion is currently occurring. There has been a lot of work, many ad hoc committees that have discussed this and, unfortunately, the resolution just doesn't seem to come to fruition with this issue.

Mr. Burgess. Are you hopeful or optimistic that that gulf could be bridged?

Mr. Fellin. Unfortunately, based on recent discussions, I feel like we are at an impasse. And the fear is that the CPSC is going to go ahead with rulemaking and incorporating of the ANSI standards without necessarily going through the ASTM process.

Well, thank you for sharing that with us. Perhaps that is something where the subcommittee could have some additional interest.

Mr. Pritchard, you were here before and I certainly thank you for your remarks this morning. It is rare, as a member of Congress, when we hear that we have done our job and things have worked. So, I appreciate you for sharing that experience with us.

But in May when you testified, your industry was right in the middle of updating its voluntary safety standard. It was contentious with the Consumer Product Safety Commission staff. How important was it for your industry that the CPSC staff

reevaluated their recommendations to the Commission once the voluntary standard was updated?

Mr. Pritchard. So, I think the factor in the middle of that, the reevaluation or the recommendation to the commissioners, I think what they have done is they have evaluated the updated draft standard, which they received late last year, seemingly approve it, based on their letter. We have had good conversations about it and in our view, we are moving forward to finalizing the voluntary standards.

At that time, we think that the staff will recommend that the Commission terminate the rulemaking. But to get from where we were to here, took a lot of steps and a lot of conversations. And frankly, Congress' involvement was crucial. There is just nothing else to say about it.

I think we were in a place where we had our position, they had their position and someone needed to help come in and break the logjam and get the parties talking to each other and listening to each other a little bit better.

And I would just want to add to that point that those conversations have continued. And so I think we are in a much better place than we were 8 months ago, even 6 months ago.

Mr. Burgess. And that is to what you attribute the breaking of the logjam? Because when you were here before, it was pretty

738 | tense.

Mr. Pritchard. It was tense and it remained that way for a while. I do believe it broke the logjam but I think you can't underestimate the CPSC staff's willingness to still engage with us in those discussion. We did keep talking. They deserve credit for continuing to talk with us and those conversations were in-person, on the telephone, offsite to see the vehicles being tested. So, it was a collective effort but I can't understate the importance of your involvement.

Mr. Burgess. Okay, just as a point of congressional trivia,

I am the chairman of the Congressional Motorcycle Caucus. So,

I wanted to share that with everyone in full disclosure.

Well, and I will, too, say, the staff at the Consumer Product Safety Commission, it has been a few years since I have been out there and visited with the staff, but I have done that. In fact, we were working on the bill in 2007 and 2008 and the staff is certainly nonpartisan. Certainly, they are dedicated to their job of consumer safety. Some days, or some things, or some areas where they look quite innovative in their ability to actually create the tools that they needed to test a particular product. So, I just want to echo your sentiment on what a good job that the staff does and certainly, they don't get singled out for praise often enough.

Mr. Gold, I just want to address one thing with you and I may provide some follow-up questions for you. In your testimony finally, I would like to briefly raise an issue that has not been discussed with the subcommittee or generally to date, the recalls being visited upon the retailer, as opposed to the manufacturer.

And when I sat on this subcommittee many years ago when Chairman Rush was the subcommittee chair, this seemed to be a significant problem that devices -- I am sorry -- products that were going to be recalled were finding their way into the country and then the recall happens. And I remember Chairman Rush expressing some concern that some of these products that were recalled for a valid reason might end up in discount houses in neighborhoods across the country. Is that to which you were referring in that part of your testimony?

Mr. Gold. Mr. Chairman, no. Unfortunately, we are seeing instances where just products in general, the CPSC is going to the retailer first to push for recalls. We were seeing some issues, two issues that were mentioned earlier like hoverboards and window coverings, where the CPSC is going through the retailer and trying to make sure that products were pulled off the shelves or a recall is done, without working through the process and working with the manufacturers.

It is a longstanding process. We just feel like there is

more emphasis now on going to the retailer because they are the consumer-facing aspect to push that action before going through the process.

And as far as the other products we were talking about, this is where kind of the worst-based methodology comes in in risk targeting and the ability to do that to make sure you don't have these volatile products coming into the country from the start.

Mr. Burgess. Yes, I do want to follow up with you in writing for the record.

Ms. Schakowsky, you are recognized for 5 minutes for questions please.

Ms. Schakowsky. Well, hoverboards have come up a number of times. They were one of the most popular holiday gift this year. But unfortunately, we have been hearing more and more reports about hoverboards exploding and catching fire unexpectedly. So far, at least 20 U.S. colleges, several major airlines, and a few cities have banned them. And some retailers have started taking them off the shelves.

Just yesterday, ABC News reported that a home fire in Tennessee was caused by a hoverboard that burst into flames. But a consumer who really wants one, can still find one and they are still unregulated.

So, Ms. Weintraub, when it becomes apparent that a new

product poses a safety risk, how can we ensure that things move quickly to reduce the number of accidents, such as leveraging rules that already exist for similar products or component parts?

Ms. Weintraub. Well, I think what you suggested is exactly right. I mean we need safety standards. And I think for this product, we don't need to start from scratch. And UL, for example, is expert in lithium-ion batteries. There are other standards. They are already moving on a standards process.

Hoverboards could fit into motorized scooters with an ASTM and they are also beginning the voluntary standard process. Since they don't need to start from scratch, hopefully, this process will move faster.

But even before a product comes on the market, we think it is the responsibility of the manufacturer to do a risk assessment, figure out what hazards could this product pose, what hazards have other similar products posed, and are there similar standards, if not exact standards that couldn't be complied with to prevent that type of hazard.

Consumers also, in a case like this, need concrete information. They need to know whether a product that their child is riding, that is sitting in their home could explode, could cause a fire.

So, we hope investigations that the CPSC is conducting, and

8.31

our understanding is they have been working around the clock, they worked over the holidays, we are very much hoping that this investigation will lead to the information so that consumers can have concrete information so that products that have caused fires will be recalled. And that is what consumers need, clear information.

While it is very positive that there are some retailers that aren't selling these products, it is still very consuming and they are still very available for purchase.

Ms. Schakowsky. Hoverboards are not exclusively a child's product. So, they are not subject to the same safety standards as toys. Is there a gap that we should be concerned? Should there be more strict standards in place for products like hoverboards which are not made just for kids but are certainly used by kids?

Ms. Weintraub. I think there is a gap for any product that is not subject to a voluntary or mandatory standard and we have seen this with infant and juvenile products, as well as with other products like hoverboards that when there is not a standard already in place, there can be risks. And I think this product very much shows what can happen when there is not a standard and when manufacturers are not testing their products to similar types of standards to ensure, in this case, that the batteries and the

charging mechanisms don't overheat and pose a fire risk.

Ms. Schakowsky. I wanted to ask you about imports. The chairman of CPSC has said that inexpensive models of hoverboards manufactured in China are of particular concern and that many of the problematic units seem to be coming from there. Customs and Border Protection recently seized almost 3,000 counterfeit hoverboards that they said "posed a potential health risk to U.S. consumers."

So, can you talk about some of the challenges associated with ensuring the safety of imported consumer products?

Ms. Weintraub. Sure, especially in cases where products are manufactured overseas, imported, and there is not an entity in the U.S., it is very difficult for the CPSC to talk with that entity, to conduct a voluntary recall, to discuss safety issues. So, I think that poses a specific risk to these types of products. I think it is for that reason that retailers who are the first contact that consumers have with these products are being contacted and do have a responsibility. And we certainly think that everyone in the supply chain from the manufacturer to the retailer, to testing labs, the entire supply chain has a responsibility to ensure that products on the market don't pose risks to consumers.

And this is also why we are very supportive of CPSC's efforts

at import surveillance because another layer in product safety is to prevent these products from entering the U.S. market and getting into our homes.

Ms. Schakowsky. Great. I will yield back. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentlelady. The gentlelady yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kansas, the author of the RIDE Act, 5 minutes for questions, please.

Mr. Pompeo. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pritchard, what are the lessons learned? How do we repeat the success that we collectively add to your industry, CPSC and their staff, us here on the committee and the Congress? What are the lessons about timing and how we can be constructive to work together to get good outcomes for consumers and for manufacturers a well?

Mr. Pritchard. So, I think there a couple steps and I will base it on our experience but I think that they can be applied fairly broadly.

One, I think when industry realizes that there is an impasse with the Commission, then industry needs to bring it to your attention and let you know that there is a problem. I think at the Commission, if they are in discussions with industry, they

should keep those discussions going.

In my view, voting out the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was a profound mistake and I will tell you why today and what I said then. Essentially, the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking puts industry on the defensive. And so then, in response, industry submits comments back, which are critical, which puts the Commission on defensive. So, at that point, it is really hard to have a discussion because everybody has basically got their backs up, trying to defend positions, rather than trying to reach the best outcome.

So, it is really this. Industry has got a part to play in keeping the discussion going. The Commission has a part to play in keeping the discussion going. And I think then Congress has to be involved early enough to be part of those discussions, to let the parties know that Congress is paying attention and that Congress is expecting a sensible resolution because I am assuming you all don't want to have to deal with legislation every time an impasse comes up, whether it is with this federal regulatory agency or another one.

Mr. Pompeo. That is a pretty fair assumption. Thank you for that.

Ms. Weintraub, you talked about the Consumer Product Safety database a little bit in your opening comments. You said there

922 were 27,000. What period was that over? Ms. Weintraub. So, that is from when it --923 924 Mr. Pompeo. Is that from inception? 925 Ms. Weintraub. Inception -- conception -- no, not 926 conception. Creation. 927 Mr. Pompeo. From when it began. 928 Ms. Weintraub. When it began. I think it went online in 929 2011 until January 21, 2016. 930 Mr. Pompeo. And tell me what benefits you can tangibly 931 identify that resulted from that. 932 Ms. Weintraub. Sure. Well, as you well know, with 6(b), 933 there was a limited amount of information that the CPSC has been 934 able to communicate naming brands of products. 935 So, before, if a consumer was interested as Mr. Fellin has 936 been, in purchasing a product for a new baby, there is limited 937 information. He is in a different case because he is an expert 938 but there is limited information that you can get from CPSC's 939 website, other than general information about hazards associated 940 with strollers, in particular. 941 So, what this database has created is a resource for 942 They could see if they are looking for a stroller what 943 consumers' experience has been. They can see if they own a 944 stroller, whether someone else has a similar experience or maybe

945 it is just specific to their use. So, I think it has really created a much more robust and much 946 947 more rich resource for consumers, as well as for researchers and 948 others. Something else we have been able to identify is sort of 949 well what are the product categories that are most represented. 950 Are there trends? So, we have looked at his data for that type 951 of stuff. 952 Mr. Pompeo. Do you know what the error rate is then, that 953 is complaints that were made, items listed of those 27 that were 954 just flat out wrong, they had the wrong manufacturer, it was un-useful information or even worse? 955 956 Ms. Weintraub. I am sorry, do I know the number that had 957 errors? 958 Mr. Pompeo. Yes, that were just flat out wrong. 959 Ms. Weintraub. I do not. 960 Mr. Pompeo. Like if somebody was mad and they wrote down 961 it was Brand X and it turned out they had nothing to do with Brand 962 Х. 963 Ms. Weintraub. I do not. 964 Mr. Pompeo. Do you know how many hours were spent for 965 manufacturers responding in the way that they are required to 966 respond by law to items that appear on the CPSC database? 967 Ms. Weintraub. I do not.

Mr. Pompeo. Do you know how much it costs them to do that?

Ms. Weintraub. I do not.

Mr. Pompeo. So, not tangible benefits that have been identified. That is, we can quantify that and you have no idea of what those costs were.

Ms. Weintraub. I do not have knowledge of those costs.

Mr. Pompeo. Great, thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentleman. The chair recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, 5 minutes for questions, please.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My questions, initially, are to Ms. Weintraub about the crumb rubber, the crumb rubber issue. Over the last several years, questions have been raised about the safety of artificial turf, which is used in schools, parks, daycare centers, and sports fields throughout the country. An NBC News report in October 2014 documented a growing group of young athletes diagnosed with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma who played on artificial turf fields filled with crumb rubber. And the crumb rubber is often made from recycled tires, which contains carcinogens.

Following the NBC report, I sent a letter to the Centers for Disease Control asking for an official study to examine risks of

continued exposure to crumb rubber. And in May 2015, during a hearing in front of this committee, CPSC Chairman Kaye agreed with me that more research is needed. And in October 2015, Chairman Upton and I sent a letter to the EPA, once again, expressing concerns on this issue. But I have to say that I am disappointed that still nothing has been done.

And clearly, this is a complicated issue. Many agencies are involved. So, Ms. Weintraub, are you aware of any existing industry standards to prevent the use of toxic chemicals in artificial turf?

Ms. Weintraub. I am not aware of a specific standard for crumb rubber. We could certainly hope that since it is going into a children's product that similar standards could be used as guidance, for instance, in terms of lead and other heavy metals, but I am not aware of a specific standard.

Mr. Pallone. Is the research sufficient to conclude that exposure to crumb rubber is safe and that it is okay for kids to play on it you think?

Ms. Weintraub. No, I do not think the research is sufficient and we very much support your position and that of the CPSC that more research is needed and that all the entities, state, federal need to work together as quickly as possible to research this issue.

Mr. Pallone. I think you answered my next question. it was about CPSC's limited resources to investigate the possible health effects of prolonged exposure to crumb rubber. And you said that you do think it would be beneficial for them, CPSC to work with the other agencies.

Artificial turf and crumb rubber has been in use for more than a decade. They are using it on playing fields, playgrounds across the country but there are a lot of serious safety questions that linger unanswered, while our children and athletes continue to be exposed. Let me ask you again. What can the CPSC do to address safety and health concerns with new products, not just crumb rubber, but with new products before they come to market so that our children are not the test subjects?

It often seems like the product comes to market and then if things go wrong, okay, then we take another look at it. Can we look do things differently in that regard?

Ms. Weintraub. I think we can. I think the responsibility lies with the manufacturers of the products to ensure that they meet standards, if standards exist. And then if no specific standards exist that they use those as guidance to ensure that they don't pose risks to consumers. We actually think that for many products, such as infant and toddler products, that product should not go on the market if there is not a voluntary standard.

Mr. Pallone. You know I think that the public thinks it is the opposite. They are shocked when you tell them well, the product goes on the market and then we see if it is safe. They assume that is has already been tested and safe before it goes on the market. But that is not the case. Correct?

Ms. Weintraub. Correct. And that is certainly true. I mean consumers perceive that if a product is available for sale that has been tested by some entity for safety. We have tried to bridge that gap with CPSIA for infant and toddler products but we still have a long way to go.

Mr. Pallone. Well, let me just ask one more question about the artificial fields. I am also concerned about the possible physical injuries that can occur while playing on artificial fields, such as joint injuries from increased resistance or burns from overheated turf. Should the CPSC also be investigating these other possible safety concerns, in your opinion?

Ms. Weintraub. Definitely.

Mr. Pallone. All right. I have a minute left. I wanted to ask a little about emerging hazards but I know I don't have much time. Is there a difference in how emerging hazards from consumer products are handled when they relate to a defect, as opposed to an unintended use, such as kids biting into laundry pods? I know when my wife starting using these laundry pods, I

was wondering what they were. My understanding is that kids will think they are candy.

So you know the question is, does that response tend to be faster for one than the other of those two types of things?

Ms. Weintraub. You know I really think, and I worked on the laundry pod issues as well as many others, and I think one of the biggest responsibilities of a manufacturer is to think of foreseeable use, which may include unintended use. But foreseeable use of how the product is used in the real world must be thought about, must be assessed, and the product must be designed for that foreseeable use.

Mr. Pallone. Okay, thanks a lot.

Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back. The chair thanks the gentleman.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Guthrie, 5 minutes for questions, please.

Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for conducting this meeting and I thank all the witnesses for being here.

My first question is for Mr. Pritchard. Based on your recent experience of vetting the ROV voluntary standard, should we be concerned about how the Commission is using or not using scientific data to support these policy positions?

Mr. Pritchard. Our experience was that the data did not support the Commission's claims.

I want to go back in time. We received the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in a briefing package and it had a lot of claims in it with references to data and incident reports that were separate. So, we requested all of those records and all that data and couldn't get it. We couldn't get it and we ultimately filed a FOIA appeal, which was granted in its entirety some months later.

When we dug into the data, the data did not match, in our view, the claims and we explained that in our comments back to the Commission in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. I don't know if that means that there is a profound issue or a fundamental issue. I can just tell you that we had an issue with the data.

Mr. Guthrie. Mr. Gold or Mr. Fellin, do you have any comments on that type of -- that is fine. I have got another question. You can go ahead.

Mr. Fellin. We have had similar concerns along the ASTM process where we have requested data from the agency, both verbally at ASTM meeting and then also in writing to the various CPSC staff members on it and have been denied that information.

Mr. Guthrie. I have a question for you, Mr. Fellin. In May 2012, the GAO published a report recommending that the Commission

staff participate more actively in the voluntary standards process. Given your experience with the agency, is the delay between the publication data of the GAO report, May of 2012, and the effective date of the new rules, March 3rd of this year, typical?

Mr. Fellin. I think it all depends on staff resources and the priorities of a given commission.

Mr. Guthrie. Well, given the importance of voluntary standards to the product safety and the Commission's mission, should this rule update have been priority over other of their undertakings?

Mr. Fellin. From JPMA's perspective, CPSC already plays a vital role in the 104 rulemakings, which I think are a unique standard-setting process. We raised concerns with the proposed rule mainly that agency staff not have undue influence over the process and that staff not dictate Commission decisions. But I can't speak as to whether or not it should have been a higher priority for other industries.

Mr. Guthrie. Okay, thank you very much.

And Mr. Gold, you mentioned the Commission's open meetings policy in your testimony. Transparency is what we all want to see happen. It is a government good. It is what we need to have in place but just a question about it.

What impact does this policy have on the Commission's ability to communicate with industry and are there circumstances where Commission resources have benefitted from feedback from the industry prior to releasing the proposed rule?

Mr. Gold. Thank you, Congressman. So, I think the alpha pilot is probably the prime example of where there was an issue because, as this working group was created under the COAC, which is a Customs advisory committee, we had plenty of discussions with Customs but yet, CPSC was not in the room for these discussions, our technical discussions on how supply chains work, how data is transferred, who owns it at what point in time. So, as this is a CPSC rulemaking, they are going to be relying on CBP to collect the data, not having CPSC in the room to understand some of these difficulties was a little challenging because we would have to CBP to provide us information from CPSC with questions and challenges, and that we would have the discussion, and we would have to rely back on CBP to go back to CPSC to do the interpretations.

So, we fully understand transparency and the need for that but there are certain times when you have to have these technical meetings where you have companies who are talking about very business confidential information as far as how their supply chains work and what data they have and when they have it. Those

kinds of meetings get very technical and we think should be closed.

And this is where an advisory committee, whether it is a FACA or some other committee could help with this process moving forward.

It would have been nice, had we had the opportunity to have these working group discussions or stakeholder meetings before the 1110 rule was put out to talk about some of this so we didn't have a rule put out that everybody was opposed to and listed a whole number of concerns. Had we had those discussions in advance and talked about the complexities, and really had discussion about what is it that CPSC wants, what it is that industry can provide, it would have been a better position to be in than where we are now. We are glad we have the pilot in place to really work through some of these technical issues and try and figure out how this is best going to work.

Again, we are very supportive of risk-based targeting. We think this will help but because of the complexities, we can't just put a rule out and expect everyone to do it. This needs to be worked through because of the technical aspect of it.

Mr. Guthrie. Okay, thank you. My time has expired. I yield back.

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentleman. The gentleman yields back.

The chair recognizes the gentlelady from New York, Ms.

1175 Clarke, 5 minutes for questions, please.

Ms. Clarke. I thank you, Chairman Burgess for this very important hearing. And to all of our witnesses today, thank you for lending your expertise to the subject matter at hand.

I want to raise the issue of recall effectiveness. We would all like to avoid problems before they happen but sometimes unexpected harms arise. In these cases, the CPSC works with the manufacturer of a defective product to conduct a recall but notice to consumers is difficult and recall response rates tend to be very low.

So, Ms. Weintraub, do you have any ideas on how the CPSC or industry can be more proactive in reaching consumers when there is a recall on a product?

Ms. Weintraub. Yes, I do. Thank you very much for the question.

Both Kids in Danger and the chairman have said that those involved in selling products should use the same amount of energy and resources that they do to sell a product to get a product back that has been recalled. And we are very far from that goal.

I think there are many things that both the CPSC and those in the supply chain can do, using innovative technology, using social media, using information that retailers and others have about consumers who bought specific products. I think one of the

issues is targeting the right people, ensuring that the people who have the product, who bought the product know about a recall.

I also think it is important for the information to be clear. These things should be called recalls. They should be available on the websites. They should be communicated clearly with a very clear action for what the consumer should do, clearly articulating the risk. And I think this is a subject that many have been working on for a long time but it needs a lot more attention.

Ms. Clarke. Thank you.

Mr. Fellin, the Danny Keysar Child Product Safety

Notification Act requires manufacturers of durable infant

products to provide consumers with a postage-paid registration

card with each product to improve the effectiveness and response

rate of recalls. What are your member companies doing to increase

the rate of return on those registration cards?

Mr. Fellin. Recall effectiveness is something that I think our industry, as well as the consumer groups and governmental have the same priority and that is to get the message out as quickly as possible. We were proud last year to actually work with CFA and the consumer groups to develop an "It's Not Hard! Fill Out the Card!" campaign. And the whole process of that was to educate consumers that it takes 2 minutes. It is postage paid for, fill out the card, get it back to the manufacturer.

While manufacturers continue to try and figure out innovative ways to try and reach the consumer, the last thing we want as an industry is to have a product that has been recalled reach the hands of another consumer and we look to continue to work with the agency. And I have asked the agency, in meetings with them, to conduct a workshop that would bring a lot of these issues to the foreground and discuss recall effectiveness because it is a priority for industry as well.

Ms. Clarke. You just mentioned that you are looking into alternative methods as well. Can you drill down on that a little bit?

Mr. Fellin. Of course. A lot of our manufacturers, based on the fact that a lot of parents nowadays are younger and much more tech savvy have also published registration information on their web pages. There is also technology out there that has begun to allow to take pictures of various information will allow the products to be registered that way. So, we are constantly evaluating and looking at ways in which to improve that aspect of products.

Ms. Clarke. Very well. Thank you.

Mr. Gold, often, manufacturers do not have a relationship with consumers but retailers do. What are you member companies doing to help get notice to consumers when there is a recall?

1244	Mr. Gold. You know I think they are doing as much as they
1245	possibly can. I think, again, as Mr. Fellin said, having this
1246	workshop to talk about recall effectiveness and how messages are
1247	put out I think is very important. It is not as easy for a retailer
1248	to just throw up a recall notice on their website, there are
1249	challenges there. And I think we need to talk through that and
1250	figure what is the best way
1251	Ms. Clarke. You said they are doing the best that they can.
1252	Is there something specific that they are doing?
1253	Mr. Gold. I don't have the specifics
1254	Ms. Clarke. Okay.
1255	Mr. Gold how retailers are doing it. It really
1256	depends on the retailer, the relationship, how they are getting
1257	information out the customers or the users.
1258	Ms. Clarke. Any examples?
1259	Mr. Gold. I don't have any.
1260	Ms. Clarke. Okay.
1261	Mr. Gold. I can provide you some later on. I just can't
1262	provide you any right now.
1263	Ms. Clarke. Okay, sure. Thank you.
1264	Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Indiana, Mrs.

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

1265

1266

Brooks, 5 minutes for questions, please.

Mrs. Brooks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the witnesses for their insight.

Indiana is actually the home of a very, very large presence of toy companies and juvenile product manufacturers across our state. And Mr. Fellin, you probably know well that Dorel is the largest juvenile product manufacturer in the nation. It is based outside of my district down in Columbus, Indiana, but 950 people work around the clock many shifts to try to ensure that they are producing incredibly safe, the safest products possible.

I have a company called IMMI based in Westfield that works closely with Dorel to try to ensure that they are designing products that are safest on the road. And then in my district that I recently visited a toy manufacturer -- I am sorry -- a puzzle manufacturer called Package Right, a puzzle facility in Tipton, and I am very pleased to learn that they actually brought production back from China in order to ensure safety and to reinvest in our economy.

Back in May, I asked the chairman and Mr. Fellin, I will start with you, I asked the chairman of the CPSC about what actions they have taken to provide relief to companies for some of the third party testing requirements and he mentioned the Office of the Ombudsman, that it is providing support and assistance to find

out whether or not they need certain testing. And I am curious whether or not from your companies that you work with, how have they found the Ombudsman Office either helpful or is it sufficient in reducing the costs and burdens to your member companies?

Mr. Fellin. I don't know if it has necessarily helped in reducing the cost. But in terms of helping navigate a very complex regulatory framework, the Office of the Ombudsman has been extremely helpful in that capacity.

Mrs. Brooks. Are you still dealing with a lot of the smaller manufacturers with respect to their third party testing burdens and can you share a bit more about that?

Mr. Fellin. Absolutely and it doesn't just extend to the small manufacturers. Our large manufacturers feel the testing burden just the same.

We are certainly encouraged by the agency's desire to promulgate studies on ways to reduce burden and our industry has been very active and testified at the CPSC hearings with regards to burden reduction.

Since Congress allocated funds specific to burden reduction, we have yet to see any meaningful reduction in that capacity but we certainly would welcome it.

Mrs. Brooks. And when did that happen that Congress allocated?

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

1295

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

1304

1305

1306

1307

1308

1309

1310

1311

1312

Mr. Fellin. I believe in last year's Appropriations Bill, they allocated \$1 million.

Mrs. Brooks. And you have seen nothing done with that \$1 million?

Mr. Fellin. To my knowledge, we have not seen anything that would provide meaning for you.

Mrs. Brooks. Okay. I am curious whether or not any of the other panelists are aware as to whether or not CPSC has used the appropriated dollars. Is anyone aware of this issue?

Mr. Gold. I am aware of the issue but I am not aware, again, as Mr. Fellin, that the work continues. I think folks are waiting to continue to see CPSC put out more guidance and more ways for companies to reduce testing burdens. I know there was additional monies put in the budget but we are, again, waiting to see the effectiveness of this.

Mrs. Brooks. Mr. Gold and Mr. Fellin, you both mentioned in your testimony a lack of transparency in the Commission's justification for a number of the activities, including proposals to amend the voluntary standards processes and proposed rulemakings. How important do you think it is for the Commission to justify its activities and prioritization of activities? And it would seem that it would help this committee ensure that the committee's actions are directly tied to its critical safety

mission in a measurable way. And so how important is it that you think, and I guess all of you, to justify its activities and prioritization of its activities, when we don't know how they are using even the funds that have already been appropriated?

Mr. Fellin. The CPSC routinely says that they are a data-driven agency and they continue to request from our members data when making any decision. And I think, in any relationship, providing data and a rationale for why you are doing things just provides good dialogue. And I would hope that in any decision that they were making, that they provided the proper rationale for doing so.

Mrs. Brooks. Mr. Gold?

Mr. Gold. I would agree. I think two-way communication is critical, especially as you are looking at some of these issues to get a full understanding of what the issue is and what is a reasonable response and how do we move forward is critically important.

We see this with other agencies as well. We think it is important to have the bidirectional conversation and bidirectional education, where the complexities in the supply chain are understood and realized. So, if there are issues with recall, let's have a workshop and a dialogue so that you get the best and brightest minds in a room and have a conversation on how

1359 | to make this work better.

If there are issues of recall is not happening because of some companies who don't do it, don't punish those who are always doing this the right way. Let's focus on how do we go after those bad actors.

So, I think that conversation is extremely important and the justification is just as important.

Mrs. Brooks. Thank you. And just from my conversations, Mr. Chairman, child safety is number one priority for all these companies. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. Burgess. The chair thanks the gentlelady.

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. Welch.

Mr. Welch. No, I yield, Mr. Chairman. I don't have questions.

Mr. Burgess. Very well. The chair then recognizes the vice chair of the subcommittee, Mr. Lance from New Jersey, 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Lance. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gold, at a recent public Commission meeting, there was a discussion between the Commissioner Buerkle, whom we know, and Import Surveillance staff about the new pilot project to improve targeting of potentially unsafe products at the border. During the discussion and the video is available on the Commission's

website, the staff was asked about its justification for adding the name of the testing lab to the list of mandatory disclosures for the pilot.

The staff said that it had no quantitative information to support the proposal. Is it concerning that the Commission is putting together a pilot program without data to support its work and is there a risk that this undermines the willingness of companies to participate in the project?

Mr. Gold. Yes, but again, our hope is that with the pilot project we can actually identify what are the data elements that are needed to help enhance risk management.

Part of the concern is that there is always a request for more data but more data isn't always necessary. From our perspective, we would have had a better conversation from the outset with CPSC asking what data do you think you need, what are you currently getting, and how is that helping risk assessment, as opposed to just putting out a notice saying here is what we think we need but not fully understanding the process by which all that information is acquired and what benefit that might actually accrue to the agency.

So, again, coming back to having an advisory committee to fully dig into these issues before a notification or regulation is put out, we think is extremely important. Again, especially

if there is no justification on the front end for why they need it, then we have to question well, why are you proposing it.

So, again, having that conversation in advance to get a full understanding of what the concern is, how can we better address it and going into the conversation about what data is available, who owns it at what point in time, how readily available is it, how can we can get it to the Commission, we think are all questions that should have been done in advance of the NPRM coming out.

Hopefully now, with a pilot project in place, a lot of these questions can be addressed.

Mr. Lance. Thank you. Is there anyone else on the panel who would like to comment?

Mr. Gold, how important is the voluntary recall process to retailers? How would the changes proposed by the Commission to the voluntary recall process have an impact on retailer's ability to get potentially harmful products off of their shelves?

Mr. Gold. It is extremely important and I think, as was noted earlier in the discussion today, it is an award-winning program. The Commission, themselves, have noted that it is extremely important. I think there are concerns that any of these changes that have been proposed might stymie some of the information that might come to the Commission. Right now, there is times where there is not enough clarity on whether or not a

1428 report needs to be made.

So right now, retailers, they have guidance from the Commission when in doubt, report. If they have questions going forward with some of the new requirements, they not be so ready to report if they really don't have true knowledge of the issue.

So, I think continuing with the program that they have in place, if there are improvements that can be made, again, let's sit down, have a conversation and figure out what changes need to be made or adjusted to handle some of the issues.

Mr. Lance. Thank you. And again, Mr. Gold, do your members have concerns with the user fee as proposed by the CPSC in the budget request of last year and this year? And is there a scenario that your members would support such a user fee?

Mr. Gold. We definitely have concerns not knowing exactly how user fee is going to be used. There are still issues with the RAM, the Risk Assessment Methodology which is continuing to be built.

We have, in the past had issues with other agencies collecting user fees intended for one purpose, they get siphoned off for something else.

Mr. Lance. No, that never happens. No.

Mr. Gold. So, that continues to be a concern. Again, if we can have full visibility into the system, how it is going to

work, and have a conversation about it before just instituting 1451 a user fee, there might be some willingness. But again, not 1452 1453 knowing how it is going to work, there are definitely concerns. 1454 Mr. Lance. Thank you. Is there anyone else on the panel 1455 who would like to comment? 1456 Seeing none, then, Mr. Chairman, I yield back 45 seconds. 1457 Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back and the chair thanks 1458 the gentleman. 1459 Let me just ask if there is anyone on the subcommittee who would seek additional time with our witnesses this morning. 1460 1461 Seeing no further members wishing to ask questions for our 1462 panel, I would like to thank, again, our witnesses for being here 1463 today. 1464 Before we conclude, I would like to submit the following 1465 documents for the record by unanimous consent. A letter to the 1466 subcommittee from the American Home Furnishings Alliance, a 1467 statement from the Retail Industry Leaders Association. 1468 [The letter from of the American Home Furnishings Alliance 1469 follows:] 1470 ********INSERT 5****** 1471

1472	[The prepared statement of the Retail Industry Leaders
1473	Association follows:
1474	
1475	**************************************

[Whereupon, at 11:37 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

1476	Mr. Burgess. Pursuant to committee rules, I remind members
1477	they have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the
1478	record and I ask the witnesses to submit their responses within
1479	10 business days upon the receipt of those questions.
1480	Without objection, then the subcommittee is adjourned.

1481